



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*MN*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,813	05/01/2001	Curt Wohlgemuth	OMN10008	6351

7590 07/03/2007  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
ATTN: Mr. Brian R. Coleman  
101 Jefferson Drive  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

EXAMINER
----------

LANIER, BENJAMIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/03/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/847,813

Applicant(s)

WOHLGEMUTH ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin E Lanier

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 10-12, 19, 25, 35-37, 40, 41 and 43-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3, 10-12, 19, 25 and 43-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-37, 40 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election of Species 2 in the reply filed on 25 June 2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 1-3, 10-12, 19, 25, 43-50 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 25 June 2007.

### *Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant argues, in the remarks dated 10 May 2007, that Vinson does not disclose "whether to grant an access based on the history of previous requests...using a pre-determined pattern of piracy...whether a critical section of streaming software files that requires protection from piracy is being requested." This argument is used for all claims drawn to the elected species (claims 35-57, 40, and 41).
4. In response, because Applicant elected species 2, the above mentioned claim limitations are now drawn to non-elected species and are considered withdrawn from consideration.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

Art Unit: 2132

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 35-37, 40, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vinson, U.S. Patent No. 6,453,334. Referring to claims 35-36, Vinson discloses a method and apparatus to allow remotely located computer programs to be accessed on a local computer using a network file system that simulates a local drive on a client computer (Col. 1, lines 13-24 & Col. 2, lines 37-43). The user uses their web browser to navigate a web site, and clicks on link indicating a target program listed on a web page (Col. 5, lines 40-42). The link points to the index file for that target program. (Col. 5, lines 42-43). The web browser initiates retrieval of the index file, and based on the MIME type for the index file, knows that the index file should be downloaded to the client machine and the client agent started with the location of the index file given as an argument to the client agent (Col. 5, lines 43-52). When authenticated the FSD will add a newly created process to its list of processes that can access the files referenced by the index file (Col. 7, lines 28-37). All file operations are handled by the FSD, which downloads, caches, decompresses, and decrypts the pieces of the program as needed (Col. 7, lines 47-50), which meets the limitation of a processing device for processing a request for access to streaming software files stored on at least one server system that is remote from said processing device. For requests that contain a path, access will be granted to each top level directory in which the corresponding program descriptor block contains the current process ID in it's process access list (Col. 14, lines 42-46). Requests that do not contain a path are handled on a case-by-case manner (Col. 14, lines 52-53), which meets the limitation of a redirector component that is associated with said processing device for informing said processing device of one or more locations in which said streaming software files are stored. Before the target files are accessed

Art Unit: 2132

(Col. 6, lines 52-58), authentication is performed based upon a username and password (Col. 6, lines 25-28, 47-49), which meets the limitation of wherein said processing device comprises a component that determines whether to grant requests for access to said streaming software files based on whether an originating process that is making said requests for access is a trusted process.

Referring to claim 37, Vinson discloses a method and apparatus to allow remotely located computer programs to be accessed on a local computer using a network file system that simulates a local drive on a client computer (Col. 1, lines 13-24 & Col. 2, lines 37-43). The user uses their web browser to navigate a web site, and clicks on link indicating a target program listed on a web page (Col. 5, lines 40-42). The link points to the index file for that target program. (Col. 5, lines 42-43). The web browser initiates retrieval of the index file, and based on the MIME type for the index file, knows that the index file should be downloaded to the client machine and the client agent started with the location of the index file given as an argument to the client agent (Col. 5, lines 43-52). When authenticated the FSD will add a newly created process to its list of processes that can access the files referenced by the index file (Col. 7, lines 28-37). All file operations are handled by the FSD, which downloads, caches, decompresses, and decrypts the pieces of the program as needed (Col. 7, lines 47-50), which meets the limitation of a filtering means for filtering requests for access to streaming software application program files stored remotely from said filtering means. For requests that contain a path, access will be granted to each top level directory in which the corresponding program descriptor block contains the current process ID in its process access list (Col. 14, lines 42-46). Requests that do not contain a path are handled on a case-by-case manner (Col. 14, lines 52-53), which meets the limitation of a

Art Unit: 2132

redirection means for revealing one or more locations in which said streaming software application program files are stored. Before the target files are accessed (Col. 6, lines 52-58), authentication is performed based upon a username and password (Col. 6, lines 25-28, 47-49), which meets the limitation of wherein said filtering means includes an evaluation means for evaluating an originating process that is making said requests for access.

Referring to claim 40, Vinson discloses a method and apparatus to allow remotely located computer programs to be accessed on a local computer using a network file system that simulates a local drive on a client computer (Col. 1, lines 13-24 & Col. 2, lines 37-43). The user uses their web browser to navigate a web site, and clicks on link indicating a target program listed on a web page (Col. 5, lines 40-42). The link points to the index file for that target program. (Col. 5, lines 42-43). The web browser initiates retrieval of the index file, and based on the MIME type for the index file, knows that the index file should be downloaded to the client machine and the client agent started with the location of the index file given as an argument to the client agent (Col. 5, lines 43-52). When authenticated the FSD will add a newly created process to its list of processes that can access the files referenced by the index file (Col. 7, lines 28-37). All file operations are handled by the FSD, which downloads, caches, decompresses, and decrypts the pieces of the program as needed (Col. 7, lines 47-50). For requests that contain a path, access will be granted to each top level directory in which the corresponding program descriptor block contains the current process ID in its process access list (Col. 14, lines 42-46). Requests that do not contain a path are handled on a case-by-case manner (Col. 14, lines 52-53), which meets the limitation of providing information relating to one or more remote locations where streaming software files are stored. Before the target files are accessed (Col. 6, lines 52-58), authentication

Art Unit: 2132

is performed based upon a username and password (Col. 6, lines 25-28, 47-49), which meets the limitation of determining whether an originating process that is making said requests for access is a trusted process.

Referring to claim 41, Vinson discloses a method and apparatus to allow remotely located computer programs to be accessed on a local computer using a network file system that simulates a local drive on a client computer (Col. 1, lines 13-24 & Col. 2, lines 37-43). The user uses their web browser to navigate a web site, and clicks on link indicating a target program listed on a web page (Col. 5, lines 40-42). The link points to the index file for that target program. (Col. 5, lines 42-43). The web browser initiates retrieval of the index file, and based on the MIME type for the index file, knows that the index file should be downloaded to the client machine and the client agent started with the location of the index file given as an argument to the client agent (Col. 5, lines 43-52). When authenticated the FSD will add a newly created process to its list of processes that can access the files referenced by the index file (Col. 7, lines 28-37). All file operations are handled by the FSD, which downloads, caches, decompresses, and decrypts the pieces of the program as needed (Col. 7, lines 47-50). For requests that contain a path, access will be granted to each top level directory in which the corresponding program descriptor block contains the current process ID in its process access list (Col. 14, lines 42-46). Requests that do not contain a path are handled on a case-by-case manner (Col. 14, lines 52-53), which meets the limitation of a means for providing location information to a local computing system of streaming software files that are stored on one or more remote locations. Before the target files are accessed (Col. 6, lines 52-58), authentication is performed based upon a username and password (Col. 6, lines 25-28, 47-49), which meets the limitation of a means for examining

Art Unit: 2132

requests for access to said streaming software files, a means for determining whether said requests can be granted based on whether an originating process that is making said requests for access is a trusted process, a means for forwarding said requests to a corresponding server that is responsible for serving said streaming software files if said requests are granted.

*Conclusion*

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E. Lanier whose telephone number is 571-272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30am-5:00pm, F 7:30am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Benjamin E. Lanier